R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 116 CG 001 022

A MODEL PROJECT FOR UNDERGRADUATE SOCIAL WELFARE EDUCATION.

PUB DATE JUN 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.04 24P.

DESCRIPTORS- COLLEGE STUDENTS, SOCIAL WELFARE, *SOCIAL WORK, GRADUATE STUDENTS, *COLLEGE CURRICULUM, RESEARCH METHODOLOGY, EDUCATION, *DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS, *INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH, SCHUBERTS ASSESS. OF S.W. STUD. PERS., CALIFORNIA PSYCH. INVENTORY

THE UNDERGRADUATE SOCIAL WELFARE COURSE AT SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY IS DESCRIBED. THE MAJOR IS TAKEN WITHIN THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES. A BACHELOR OF ARTS DEGREE IS AWARDED UPON COMPLETION OF THE PROGRAM. THE PROGRAM IS INTERDISCIPLINARY. IT INVOLVES SOCIAL WELFARE COURSES, PSYCHOLOGY, POLITICAL SCIENCE, ECONOMICS, AND SOCIOLOGY COURSES, AND ELECTIVES. WITHIN THE EXISTING FRAMEWORK, A PILOT EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH IS DESCRIBED. IT IS ORGANIZED ALONG THE LINES OF A GRADUATE PROGRAM. COURSE MATERIAL TIES IN SEQUENTIALLY, AS WELL AS IN CONTENT, WITH A GRADUATE PROGRAM. THE CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES FOR AN UNDERGRADUATE SOCIAL WELFARE-GRADUATE SOCIAL WORK CONTINUUM ARE PRESENTED, AS IS THE DESIGN FOR THE PILOT UNDERGRADUATE SOCIAL WELFARE PROGRAM. (SK)

ED014116

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

June 1967

A MODEL PROJECT

FOR

UNDERGRADUATE SOCIAL WELFARE EDUCATION

The social welfare major has been in existence at San Diego State since 1950. The major was originally housed in the Department of Sociology, but was shifted to the administration of the School of Social Work in 1962. The number of majors has grown from some thirty students in 1957 to its present body of 210 students. Likewise, the number of faculty has grown from one in 1957 to its present four members.

It has always been the deep conviction and intention of the faculty to maintain and enrich its liberal arts focus. The location of the major within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Bachelor of Arts degree, the prerequisites to the major and requisite courses, and the nature of the social welfare courses all reflect its identification with libert arts education.

In addition, the social welfare major is truly an interdisciplinary program. Besides the required 12 semester units of social welfare courses, students are required to take 24 units of upper division political science, economics, sociology, and psychology courses. In addition, students, after consultation with their faculty advisers, generally take electives in anthropology, literature, philosophy, and physiology.

The four social welfare courses are offered during the junior and senior years in the following sequence: History and Philosophy of Social Welfare; Social Welfare Organization; Methods of Social Work; and Field Experience in Social Welfare. These four courses are taught during each semester and are open to all students who meet the prerequisites for the courses, regardless of whether they are social welfare majors or not.

The first two courses are designed to provide students with an understanding of the nature and form of society's institutional response to the related needs of its citizens. Basic to these two courses are helping students understand, evaluate, and analyze the relationship between the evolving social welfare institution and the underlying value orientations of the American society, in particular. Throughout, the students are required to focus on the concept of social change and, with it, the potential directions for new policies and programs.

CG 001 022

In the Methods of Social Work course, students are introduced to the concept of profession, its significance in society, and the place of social work among the professions. Additional objectives are to deepen students' understanding of social work goals, values, knowledge, and methods. Within the broad framework of the helping process, an attempt is made to have students carefully analyze the social work helping approach, to have an opportunity to discover the nature of involvement in the social work profession, and to develop a sense of commitment leading toward employment in social welfare and/or professional education in social work.

The Field Experience in Social Welfare course has been designed to allow students to gain a first-hand knowledge and greater understanding of the network of social welfare programs in the community, and to achieve a further primary understanding of the impact of varying social problems upon individuals, small groups, and communities. In addition, through seminars and through the field experience itself, an attempt is made to help students to integrate and apply knowledge, theories, and understanding derived from foundation courses in social welfare and other relevant disciplines. And, of course, having the benefit of a field experience allows students to test their career choice.

From the inauguration of the School of Social Work at San Diego State College in 1962, there has been faculty agreement that:

(a) there needs to be clarification of the relationship between professional education for social work and undergraduate education for social welfare;

(b) faculty members at both levels should work together and eventually perhaps participate in both, depending upon the objectives agreed upon;

(c) the unique and common objectives at each level should be identified; and

(d) an attempt, experimentally, to develop a continuum of education for social work should be made.

Within the above mentioned context, a proposal was made to the National Institute for Mental Health for a pilot experimental project, related to the three primary purposes of undergraduate social welfare education, namely;

(a) to contribute to the liberal education of all students;

(b) to enhance the employability of those students seeking positions within the social services immediately after receiving the bachelor's degree; and

(c) to prepare students more adequately for admission to schools of social work.

Two subsidiary purposes also seem implicit, namely:

(d) recruitment to the field by making its nature and opportunities known to undergraduate students who are involved in deciding on a career choice; and

(e) provision of knowledge and understanding of the field for students preparing for related professions.

It was proposed that in the project an attempt would be made to develop an undergraduate curriculum in social welfare which would achieve all of the stated objectives and at the same time provide an undergraduate-graduate educational continuum which would:

(a) clarify and enhance the role of undergraduate education for social welfare; and

(b) make possible a significant upgrading of the quality of education in schools of social work.

The assumptions on which this project were based may be stated as follows:

(1) Any education which helps the student to communicate effectively, gives him an historical and comparative background against which to view the present and project the future, helps develop his power of logical thinking, provides him with bases for analysis and problem-solving, for cultural enjoyment, and for value judgment, and gives him a sense of his own importance and responsibility in the national world society, has helped fulfill the goals of a liberal education.

(2) That the junior and senior year of the undergraduate program for social welfare offers opportunity to provide sequences which would undergird the major sequences in the M.S.W. curriculum, namely, Social Welfare Policy and Services, Human Behavior and Social Environment, and Social Work Practice. Thus, courses in the junior or senior year on Man in Society could help the student synthesize the knowledge he has gained from psychology, biology, the social sciences and related subjects to give him a better understanding of man as a psycho-social-biological being. Well-organized and well-taught undergraduate courses of this type would serve many purposes, but their chief contributions might be to provide:

(a) the undergraduate major who enters social work employment after achieving the bachelor's degree with a much better understanding of man in society and a foundation on which to build this knowledge further through staff development; and

(b) an undergraduate foundation for the Human Behavior and Social Environment sequence in a school of social work which could be more truly professional in teaching students the significance of the knowledge content of such a sequence and its application in practice. The knowledge explosion in this area has been overwhelming. Much of it can be competently handled by undergraduate students, some of whom already seem to be getting a great deal of such content in their undergraduate courses.

One or two undergraduate courses in the area of Social Welfare as a Social Institution could be developed which would give students a good basic understanding of the evolution of the programs and services which have been developed to meet the changing needs of people. Such courses could give students an understanding of the basic social institutions of our society, their evolution, changing theories in relation to them, and the conflicts which have been a part of their development. Such programs as corrections, recreation, public health, and mental health might well be included. The courses should deal with these programs from the point of view of their contribution to the achievment of the goals of a democratic society and the pressures and means by which they have been changed over the years.

Such courses could identify the leaders, including social workers, who have helped develop these programs, examine the arguments advanced for and against particular programs, policies and courses of action, assess results,and project future needs. The subject is so vast and so complicated that the sequence in Social Welfare Policy and Services in schools of social work can do little more than introduce it to the student who has only the usual undergraduate liberal arts course of study. If the undergraduate student could study this curriculum area from an historical and comparative point of view under a faculty member having first-hand knowledge of the administration of social services, his preparation for employment and his potential forfurther in-service training would be greatly enhanced. The sequence in social policy and services in schools of social work could be greatly strengthened if students brought a background of common knowledge which would make it possible to teach this sequence much more analytically in relation to current programs, with reference to legislation, policies, structure, organization, and interdisciplinary relationships.

Perhaps the most controversial curriculum area in relation to the general scheme proposed for consideration in the development of a continuum of undergraduate-graduate education, lies in the methods sequence. There is real difficulty in knowing what method content can be taught at the undergraduate level without doing violence to the liberal arts base of undergraduate education and in resisting the continuous pressure to add more content that is exerted by employing agencies which tend to be more concerned with their immediate personnel needs than with the longer point of view of the educational institution.

It is our contention that the education of undergraduate students interested in a social welfare career, whether they take immediate employment after the bachelor's degree or continue in a school of social work, would be enhanced if they had an understanding of the values, goals and methods of social work, and a comprehension of the appropriate uses and logic of these methods. Such content at the undergraduate level, particularly if the two-line career plan materializes and undergraduate education for social welfare provides the education base for one and graduate education the base for the other, will help bridge the philosophical and value gap that now exists between those in practice who have the M.S.W. and those without professional education for the field. This would be a major contribution to one of the most troublesome problems in the field of social work, particularly if those without professional degree are to be admitted to the professional membership association as is now under consideration.

It is further assumed that field experience for undergraduate students, involving participation in agency and other social welfare functions, is a tremendous stimulation to learning. The potential our field offers for this experience have not been exploited. Furthermore, it would be a way of preparing these students for employment and/or professional education. Such field experience, if given under imaginative and well-planned educational direction,will not only foster an interest in learning but also teach the student about agency administration, the organization of social services within the community, financing, the relation of voluntary and public agencies and programs, and public relations, and other usable knowledge which would enhance performance and add to the readiness of students for immediate employment or for professional education.

Earlier mention was made of the major sequences at the master's level. These sequences are five:

(1) Human Behavior and Social Environment, concerned with the knowledge of man's physical, psychological, and social growth and behavior. The undergraduate equivalent and precurser in the new program would be Man in Society, briefly described above.

(2) Social Welfare Policy and Services, concerned with the changing structures, attitudes, philosophies, and programs of social welfare in our society and reactions of the society to them. The undergraduate equivalent and precurser of this sequence in the new program would be Social Welfare as a Social Institution, also alluded to above.

(3) Social Work Practice, concerned with the intervention methods in social work practice, an integrated approach in contrast to the traditional casework, group work, and community organization pattern. The undergraduate equivalent and precurser of this sequence in the new program would be Social Work: A Helping Profession in Social Welfare, and would provide an understanding

of the values, goals, and methods of social work and a comprehension of the appropriate uses and logic of these methods as noted earlier.

(4) Field Instruction, a sequence that requires no elaboration, would have its counterpart at the undergraduate level, Field Experience in Social Welfare, geared to providing experiences in certain social welfare activities and providing seminars as an integrating device.

(5) Social Research, which includes the definition and purpose of research in social work, techniques and methods used in collecting, organizating, and interpreting social welfare and related data, as well as the preparation of a written research report.

You will note from the foregoing that the organization of the new undergraduate program will be somewhat different than the traditional undergraduate sequence. It will be organized along the same lines as the graduate program with course material that ties in sequentially as well as in content with the graduate program. One of the difficulties to be faced in developing this continuum is to establish criteria which will provide the framework for determining what content is appropriate at the undergraduate and graduate levels and in what sequence it should come.

At the undergraduate level in the new approach then, we would develop the following courses, presented as course descriptions:

100 A - 100 B. Man in Society (3-3) I, II
Prerequisites: Biology 1 and 2, Psychology 1, and Sociology 1; Social Welfare 100 A is a prerequisite to 100 B.
Biological, psychological and social aspects of human growth and development from birth to death. Integration of concepts selected from various disciplines.

180 A - 180 B. Social Welfare as a Social Institution (3-3) I, II
Prerequisites: Sociology 1 and 10; Social Welfare 180 A is prerequisite to 180 B.
The institutional nature of social welfare and its relationship to other institutions in society.

182. Social Work as a Profession (3) I, II
Prerequisite: Social Welfare 100 B and 180 B.
Social Work as a Profession; its philosophical bases, values, norms, functions, methods and occupational roles.

187. Current Developments in Social Work (3) II
Prerequisites: Sociology 60 or equivalent; Social Welfare 100 B and 180 B.
Sources, nature, and uses of social work theory and research. Application of the principles of scientific analysis to the study of social welfare institutions and the practice of social work.

189 A - 189 B. Field Experience in Social Welfare (3-3) I, II
One lecture and eight hours field work.
Prerequisites: Social Welfare 100 B and 180 B; Social Welfare 189 A and credit or concurrent registration in 182 are prerequisites to 189 B.
Laboratory field assignments in selected social welfare activities.

Certain existing courses at the undergraduate level, entitled as follows, would be dropped:

History & Philosophy of Social Welfare
Social Welfare Organization
Methods of Social Work
Social Group Work
Social Work & the Law
Community Welfare Organization
Child Welfare
Field Assignment in Social Work

This does not mean that the content of these courses would be necessarily dropped. Some ofthe content would be incorporated and integrated into the new courses.

The chart on page eight develops the organizational relationship between basic knowledge areas and social welfare and social work content areas. It is our position that one curriculum should meet all three objectives, namely, preparation for citizenship, preparation for immediate practice, and preparation for schools of social work. We also believe that the social welfare courses being placed in sequences that are related in a continuum to the graduate sequences should provide a better base for immediate practice and staff development than is now the case. In addition, it should make possible a significant upgrading of the quality of education in schools of social work, particularly for those students who have completed the new approach to undergraduate social welfare education.

ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BASIC KNOWLEDGE AREAS AND SOCIAL WELFARE AND SOCIAL WORK CONTENT COURSES

L O W E R A N D U P P E R D I V I S I O N

BASIC KNOWLEDGE AREA A	BASIC KNOWLEDGE AREA B	BASIC KNOWLEDGE AREA C
Focus: social systems and institutions e.g., economics, anthropology, political science, sociology, history and relevant aspects from other disciplines	Focus: small groups e.g., social psychology and related aspects from other disciplines	Focus: individual and his interaction with environment e.g., biology, psychology, philosophy, literature and relevant aspects from other disciplines

S O C I A L W E L F A R E M A J O R

Employing principles, precepts, and concepts from basic knowledge areas as part of analysis that seeks to explain or illuminate aspects of social welfare and its data.

Social Welfare as a Social Institution	Man in Society	Current Developments in Social Work	Social Work as a Profession	Field Experience in Social Welfare

U P P E R D I V I S I O N

PRACTICE ← Undergraduate

Graduate

G R A D U A T E S C H O O L

Social Welfare Policy and Services	Human Behavior and Social Environment	Social Work Research	Social Work Practice	Field Instruction

TENTATIVE OUTLINE OF CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES

FOR

SOCIAL WELFARE - SOCIAL WORK CONTINUUM

A. Undergraduate Social Welfare Curriculum Objectives

1. To sensitize the student to selected major social problems and issues.

2. To impart knowledge and appreciation of the historical, comparative, and philosophical heritage of the profession.

3. To gain knowledge of human development and interaction and to gain confidence and adequacy in working with a wide range of differences therein.

4. To develop awareness of community, state, and federal social welfare programs, their particular and interrelated functions, and the appropriate uses of them.

5. To prepare for beginning competence appropriate for entry into professional practice.

6. To understand the contributions of the social and behavioral sciences in social work as well as the uniqueness of the social work profession itself.

7. To stimulate and guide, if so indicated, enthusiasm for continued formal and informal education.

B. Track II (Experimental Graduate Curriculum) Objectives

1. To develop competence in identifying, analyzing, and assessing social problems and issues.

2. To acquire the capacity for assessing the philosophical base of the profession, for evaluating the need for change, when necessary, and for initiating calculated change therein.

3. To increase awareness and develop competence in analyzing and assessing major issues in the area of human behavior and social environment.

4. To increase awareness of social welfare programs and their interrelationships and to increase competence in facilitating their objectives, scope, policies, and methods.

5. To develop skill in analyzing, motivating, and increasing practice competence in self and others.

6. To increase judgment in using the special knowledge and skills of the social and behavioral sciences as well as in assessing when and how to involve specialists from those disciplines in social work activity.

7. To stimulate enthusiasm for and competence in continued formal education, independent study, and research.

Study Design for the Undergraduate Social Welfare Pilot Study

The underlying purpose of this project is to develop a program of undergraduate social welfare education which will enhance the performance of students after receiving the bachelor's degree, to provide a greater depth of knowledge of social welfare concepts at the undergraduate level, and to compare the level of knowledge and performance of these students with students in the existing graduate program at San Diego State College. In addition to developing an approach that will meet this purpose, the project is concerned with the development of a continuum of undergraduate with graduate curriculum.

It is envisioned that the new approach will vary substantially from the usual and traditional curriculum at the undergraduate level in content, organization, sequence and continuity. The basic design will attempt to assess the effectiveness of the new approach in preparing students for immediate employment in social welfare positions and in preparing students for professional graduate education. This would be accomplished by comparing three groups of County Welfare Department employees with baccalaureate degree and several groups of undergraduate and graduate students in the San Diego State College School of Social Work (see Chart I).

The three employee groups to be compared will be undergraduate social welfare majors from the new pilot program, undergraduate social welfare majors from other programs, and non-social welfare undergraduate majors all employed by the San Diego County Welfare Department. All three groups would be compared in regard to their effectiveness and/or performance. This is Study Design # 1 in Chart II.

The performance in the agency of the three groups of undergraduate social welfare majors would be compared by use of performance scales, and/or possibly other instruments and devices. Ratings of impartial judges, for instance, might also be utilized. It is too early in the development of the project to be more precise about evaluative mechanisms and the difficulties involved should not be minimized.

The following charts outline the various comparison possibilities and variables under consideration.

In addition to comparing those graduates from the pilot project employed by the County Welfare Department with other employees, class and field performance would be evaluated. Pilot class second semester seniors would be compared with social welfare majors who were in the 1968 graduating class and with students completing their first year of graduate school in the San Diego State College School of Social Work. This is outlined in the following two charts.

CHART I -- DESIGN OF PILOT UNDERGRADUATE SOCIAL WELFARE PROGRAM, SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

GROUPS INCLUDED IN STUDY	Experimental Group X	CONTROL GROUPS					
	X	I	II	III	IV	V	
Social Welfare Major	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Junior Status	Fall'68	Fall'66	Fall'66	Fall'66	Fall'68	Fall'68	
B. A. obtained	Spring'70	Spring'68	Spring'68	Spring'68	Spring'70	Spring'70	
VARIABLES TO BE COMPARED	COMPOSITION OF GROUPS, GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE STATUS, EMPLOYMENT STATUS, DATE OF DEGREE CONFERMENT, GRADUATE TRACK, EVALUATION PLANS, AND STUDY DESIGN NUMBER.						Evaluation Stage / Selection Criteria
Psychological and Social Attributes; Knowledge of Social Welfare Concepts	FULL CLASS PILOT CLASS 2nd Sem.Sr. (Xa)	FULL CLASS 2nd Sem. Sr. (Ia)	Study Design #1 UNDERGRADUATE (Evaluation, Summer, 1970)				A / Two Year Social Welfare Majors SDSC
Psychological and Social Attributes; Knowledge of Social Welfare Concepts; Performance in Field Experience	SELECT STUDENTS (Xb) 2nd Sem Sr. B.A. Completed Spring 1970	SELECT STUDENTS (Ib) 2nd Sem Sr. B.A. Completed Spring 1968	SELECT STUDENTS (IIa) 1st Yr. Grad Completed Spring 1969	SELECT STUDENTS (IIIa) 1st Yr. Grad Completed Spring 1969	Study Design #2 GRADUATE AND UNDER GRADUATE (Evaluation, Summer 1970)		B / Comparable GPA, age, meet the criteria of SDSC Grad Sch. Soc. Work
Psychological and Social Attributes; Knowledge of Social Welfare and Social Work Concepts; Performance in Field Experience	TRACK II PILOT CLASS Grad School (Xc) Complete MSW in 1971-Spring or Summer		TRACK I SELECT STUDENTS (IIb) 2nd Yr. Grad Completed Spring 1970	TRACK I SELECT STUDENTS (IIIb) 2nd Yr Grad Completed Spring 1970	Study Design #3 GRADUATE (Evaluation Summer or Fall 1971)		C / Comparable GPA, age
Psychological and Social Attributes; Knowledge of Social Welfare Concepts; Performance in Employment	EMPLOYEES COUNTY WELF. DEPT. PILOT CLASS B.A.	Study Design #4 AGENCY (Evaluation, Summer, 1972)			EMPLOYEES COUNTY WELF. DEPT. B.A. Spring 1970 (IV)	EMPLOYEES COUNTY WELF. DEPT. B.A. Spring 1970 (V)	D / Employed CWD, 1971; Comparable GPA, age

CHART II
Study
Design #1

Comparison of Pilot Class Members Employed by the County Welfare Department with A.B. Graduates who are Social Welfare Majors and Non-Social Welfare Majors From Other Schools and/or Other Majors 1/

Employees of County Welfare Department (A.B. Graduates)	EMPLOYMENT PERFORMANCE 2/	PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL ATTRIBUTES 3/	KNOWLEDGE OF SOCIAL WELFARE CONCEPTS 4/
Experimental Group (Xd)			
Control Groups			
Majors (IV)*			
Non Majors (V)			

*Social Welfare Majors

1/ 1971 employees would probably be included. Some selection criteria would be applied, i.e., age, G.P.A. S.E.S., sex.
2/ Possibly Schubert's Assessment revised for this purpose, also judgment interview, also Minnesota Rehabilitation Tests*
3/ Probably California Psychology Inventory (C.P.I.) and Miller's Analogy Test.
4/ Possibly Inventory of Social Work Knowledge (Minnesota) or equivalent.

* Work adjustment questionnaires

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

CHART III
Study
Design #2

Comparison of Pre-pilot Majors in Present Under-Graduate Social Welfare Program with Pilot Class 1/

Students (Graduating Seniors)	PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL ATTRIBUTES 2/	KNOWLEDGE OF SOCIAL WELFARE CONCEPTS 3/
Experimental Group (Xa)		
Control Group (1a)		

1/ Full classes would be compared but also select groups outlined below
2/ Probably with C.P.I. and Miller's Analogy Test.
3/ Probably Minnesota Inventory of Social Work Knowledge or equivalent

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

CHART IV — Comparison of Two Groups of Undergraduate Students and Two Groups of Graduate Students Completing First Year of Graduate School at S.D.S.C.
Study Design # 5

Students (Graduating Seniors and 1st Year Graduates)	PSYCHOLOGICAL 1/ AND SOCIAL ATTRIBUTES	KNOWLEDGE OF SOCIAL WELFARE CONCEPTS 2/	FIELD 3/ PERFORM-ANCE
Experimental Group (Xb) a/			
Control Group (Ib) b/			
Control Group (IIa) c/			
Control Group (IVa) d/			

a/ Pilot Class (1970) (Note: Selection criteria would be applied, i.e. Age, GPA. etc.)
b/ Pre-pilot class (1968)
c/ First year Graduates Who Were Social Welfare Majors
d/ First year Graduates Who Were NOT Social Welfare Majors

1/ C.P.I.
2/ Probably Minnesota Inventory of Social Work Knowledge, also Miller Analogy Test
3/ Schubert's Assessment

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

When the Pilot Class is about to complete its graduate program it would be compared with the group of graduate students in Track I, with Social Welfare Majors and Non-majors. This is outlined in the diagram in Chart V.

CHART V. — Comparison of Pilot Class Completing Track II and Second Year Graduate Students Completing Track I, Those with Prior Social Welfare Majors and Those With Other Majors.
Study Design #4

Group	PSYCHOLOGICAL 1/ AND SOCIAL ATTRIBUTES	KNOWLEDGE OF 2/ SOCIAL WELFARE AND SOCIAL WORK CONCEPTS	FIELD 3/ PERFORM-ANCE
Track I			
Control Group (IIb)			
Control Group (IVb)			
Track II	(1/ C.P.I.)		
Experimental Group (Xc)	(2/ Minnesota Inventory of Social Work Knowledge or equivalent)		
	(3/ Schubert"s Assessment and Interview)		

Note: (Selection criteria would be applied, i.e., Age, G.P.A. etc)

The evaluation of the effectiveness and/or performance at the graduate level would be limited to those students admitted to the School of Social Work at San Diego State College and to those admitted no later than seven months following the receipt of the bachelor's degree to encompass February and June graduates.

Academic standing or performance would be one criteria of effectiveness and/or performance; another criteria would be performance on a comprehensive examination of the knowledge of social welfare and social work concepts to be taken at the time of admission to graduate school and re-examination prior to graduation to observe what changes have taken place and to enable a comparison to be made between the groups. In addition psychological and social attributes would be examined for change, but also used as controls in looking at other variables. Field performance would of course be evaluated. The undergraduates in the new approach would be given the identical examination at the beginning of the junior year,and again at the end of the graduate program, just prior to being awarded the M.S.W. degree. Other instruments to evaluate effectiveness and/or performance are being examined. In order to avoid the need to control for agency experience, those graduate students who entered employment following the awarding of bachelor's degree, then re-entered the graduate school, would not be included.

In addition certain comparisons can be made of characteristics (psychological and social attributes) of the three groups completing the new approach to see what factors are associated with various occupational outcome:

(a) those who go to work in a social agency;
(b) those who go on to graduate school; and
(c) those who do neither of these

This would involve follow-up with mail questionnaires and/or telephone inquiries to determine what happens to social welfare majors graduating from this program. It could be preceded by a follow-up of social welfare majors before the new approach is inaugurated to make it possible to compare educational and occupational outcomes before and after the inauguration of the new program.

To return to one of the major purposes of the project, the liberal education of students, it is probably not feasible to attempt an assessment of the effectiveness of the new approach in relationship to this factor or to the related factor of community participation. This issue would be handled by determining whether or not the new approach would meet certain criteria in providing liberal arts education and still meet the other two major objectives, namely, preparation for immediate employment and preparation for graduate school.

The assessment of the effectiveness of the "two track system" (separate curriculum in graduate school for the students who have gone through the new approach and the other two groups) would have to the subject of another research project designed to follow-up graduates with an M.S.W. coming from the two tracks to see how effectively they perform in social agencies, advance in employment, etc. This would be a long term study which would require a different design and evaluation mechanism. It would not be a part of this project.

Variables to be Considered for Purpose of Evaluation.

The variables under consideration at the present time for assessment and evaluation are many and varied. The desire of the investigators is to focus on relatively few variables, since the number of students in each of the groups is likely to be quite small. Too many variables would unnecessarily complicate the study and meaningful results would be unlikely. At present we are attempting to delimit the scope to essential variables.

The statement on design outlines the purposes of the project and suggests the outcome variables to be considered:

1) Performance in employment

   Groups: Experimental Xd and Control IV and V at stage D, employed by the County Welfare Department.

2) Performance in field experience

   Groups: Experimental Xb, Control Ib, IIa and IIIa; Experimental Xc Control IIb and IIIb in Stages A and C in field experience courses.

3) Knowledge of Social Welfare Concepts ----- all groups
4) Psychological and Social Attributes ----- all groups

A. Performance in Employment

This variable, difficult to measure at best, should encompass how the worker provides service to his clients (individuals, groups, community), how he manages his work and professional relationships, and how he relates to supervision in his own development. An adaptation of "Schubert's Assessment of Social Work Student Performance in Field Work" appears to be a good potential instrument for tapping these aspects of the employee performance (see Appendix A). In addition the Minnesota Work Adjustment questionnaires may prove to be useful.

B. Performance in Field Experience

Again, Schubert's instrument looks promising, probably without revision, for assessing student performance (see Appendix A.)

C. Concepts of Social Welfare and Social Work

Essentially this has to be reduced to the knowledge component of social work, knowledge of principles, philosophy and attitudes, in short, the the concepts of social welfare and social work. Under consideration to tap this component are merit examinations and/or instruments developed specifically to measure social welfare and/or social work concepts, knowledge of principles, and philosophy, as well as appropriate instruments for assessing attitudes.

This variable (concepts of social welfare and concepts of social work), is a very difficult one to evaluate. The necessary standardized instruments apparently have not been developed. The most promising instrument appears to be the Minnesota Inventory of Social Work Knowledge. At this point we can only say that we will utilize the best instrument that we can find or that we will develop one of our own.

D. Psychological and Social Attributes

Again this is not one variable but several. Some of the more specific variables would be age, G.P.A. Sex, S.E.S. and status of undergraduate major.

The intervening variable is participation in the new pilot undergraduate program and the new Track II graduate program.

Some other variables might be: leadership ability, self acceptance and well being, responsibility, tolerance, achievement potential, intellectual efficiency, psychological mindedness, and flexibility.

There are many ramifications to these variables and isolating the more specific and important ones is part of the difficulty. The California Psychological Inventory (CPI) may provide indicators for these variables (see appendix B).

EVALUATION

There are four stages of evaluation. Stages A and B to be completed in the Summer of 1970; Stage C to be completed in the Summer or Fall of 1971, and Stage D would be completed in the Summer of 1972.

Stage A will compare 1968 with 1970 undergraduate majors, a pre-pilot and pilot program comparison. Stage B will include a comparison of select students from Experimental Group Xa and Control Group Ia (both completing undergraduate social welfare programs) with graduate students (IIa and IIIa) completing their first year of graduate education.

In Stage C, Track I and Track II graduate students will be compared.

In Stage D, employees in the County Welfare Department from the new program will be compared with employees who have not participated in the new S.D.S.C. pilot program.

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

This is the pilot class, the first group of students to complete the new program. As Juniors in the Fall of 1968, they will enter the new program. The full class (Experimental Group Xa) completing the two year program, will be compared with the pre-pilot class discussed below (Control Ia). Select students from the pilot class (Experimental Group Xb) would be compared with select students from the 1968 class (Control Group Ib) and also select students from Groups IIa and IIIa, S.D.S.C. graduate students completing their first

year in the School of Social Work. Selection criteria for these four select groups, (Experimental Xb and Control Groups Ib, IIa and IIIa) would include age, G.P.A. and other criteria. Essentially they should all meet certain criteria for acceptance into the graduate School of Social Work at San Diego State College, whether or not they actually apply. Two of the groups will have already met this criteria by virtue of their being in the graduate School of Social Work (II and III)

Some of the pilot class will be admitted to the SDSC School of Social Work graduate program. These students will be compared at the end of their graduate program with Groups IIb and IIIb, also completing their graduate program in Track I. The pilot class (Experimental Group Xc) would be in a separate track in graduate school, Track II. Groups II and III differ from each other only in that Group II will have an undergraduate social welfare major, Group III will have had majors other than social welfare.

Note: Group II should exclude S.D.S.C. Social Welfare Majors who have had part of the new program (graduates of 1969). It should therefore include graduates from S.D.S.C. obtaining their B.A's in 1968.

In addition some of the pilot class will enter employment in the San Diego County Welfare Department. These employees would be compared with employees who have not participated in the pilot program, both social welfare majors and employees who have had a major other than social welfare and who have not participated in the pilot program. These employees from all three groups, (Experimental Xd and Control Groups IV and V) will have been employed during 1971, would have B.A.'s and be comparable in age and G.P.A's.

CONTROL GROUP I

These are undergraduate social welfare majors going through the existing program at S.D.S.C. They are the seniors in the Fall of 1967 completing their majors in Social Welfare (Control Group Ia). They will be compared by various characteristics with the pilot class graduating in the Spring of 1970.

In addition select students (Control Group Ib) from this class would be compared to a like group from the pilot class with similar G.P.A's, age, etc.

They would be administered the necessary inventories and examinations in the Spring of 1968. Their field placement experience might be evaluated by the Schubert Assessment Scale, their academic performance by grades, their knowledge of social welfare concepts by an appropriate comprehensive examination such as the Minnesota Inventory of Social Work Knowledge.

Note: The class graduating in the Spring of 1969 cannot be utilized because they will have had part of the old program and part of the new.

Groups II and III

These two groups differ only in their undergraduate majors as noted above. They are graduate students admitted to the School of Social Work at San Diego State College in Track I. They will have graduated with a baccalaureate in 1968 and will complete M.S.W.'s in 1970.

At the end of the first year of graduate school they would be compared to the senior pilot class. At the end of the second year Control Groups IIb and IIIb will be compared with the pilot class (Experimental Xc) completing Track II in the graduate school.

At this stage of evaluation, selection criteria for Xa, IIb and IIIb, would include G.P.A's and age.

Groups IV and V

Groups IV and V are employees in the County Welfare Department employed during 1971 with B.A.'s and comparable G.P.A.'s and age. Group IV are social welfare majors who have not participated in the S.D.S.C. pilot program and Group V are non-social welfare majors who have not participated in the S.D.S.C. pilot program. These stipulations are necessary to preclude psychology and sociology majors, for instance, who have taken several courses in the new program but are not social welfare majors.

APPENDIX A

Schubert's Assessment of Social Work Student Performance in Field Work

This is a series of scales to describe the student's level of performance in field placements, quality as well as consistency of performance. The schedule can be assessed independently by either student or instructor. It may be used to describe performance at a given point in time, to assess before and after levels of performance. Parts of the schedule can be applied to student recording with independent judgments by persons other than the instructor.

The areas covered by the scale are as follows:

A. Students Direct Work with Clients

- Perceptional diagnostic thinking
- Activity with Clients
- Attitudes towards clients
- Over-all evaluation of service to clients

B. Work Management and Professional Relationships
C. Learning

It is possible that this scale, or at least parts of it could be adapted for use at three stages of evaluation., both undergraduate and graduate level as well as those employed in the Welfare Department after graduation (with an A.B.)

(continued on next page)

The performance scale would be utilized at evaluation Stage B to compare the pilot class with the graduate students having completed their first year. It would also be used in Stage C to compare Track I and Track II students completing their M.S.W.'s. In addition, an adaptation would probably be used for Groups Xd, V and VI employed by the County Welfare Department (Stage D).

APPENDIX B

California Psychological Inventory

The California Psychological Inventory attempts to measure eighteen psychological components of variables. It is a standardized instrument and is probably one of the best of its kind. It has been utilized as a predictive instrument quite successfully.

If adopted for this project, it would be used in two different ways. One use would be to provide some control variables of psychological attributes for use in examining other variables. In addition it would be used to determine whether or not certain psychological attributes change over a period of time for the various groups and whether or not the groups initially differ in certain psychological attributes.

The variables, measures, or psychological attributes in the C.P.I. are listed on the following pages.

Class I. Measures of poise, ascendancy, and self-assurance.

1. Do (dominance) (46 items). Purpose: To assess factors of leadership ability, dominance, persistence, and social initiative. Trait equivalent: DOMINANCE - indicating dominance, leadership, initiative, and the tendency to behave in a forthright and resolute manner.

2. Cs (capacity for status) (32 items). Purpose: To serve as an index of an individual's capacity for status (rather than of his actual or achieved status). The scale attempts to measure the personological qualities and attributes which underlie and lead to status. Trait equivalent: CAPACITY FOR STATUS - reflecting the personal qualities which underlie and lead to status and social attainment; being ambitious, forceful, and interested in success; the kind of person who will get ahead in the world.

3. Sy (sociability) (36 items). Purpose: To identify persons of outgoing, sociable, participative temperament. Trait equivalent: SOCIABILITY - indicating a liking for and interest in social life and activity, being outgoing and sociable; the kind of person who enjoys group activities and likes to be with and work with other people.

California Psychological Inventory (continued)

4. Sp.(social presence) (56 items). Purpose: To assess factors such as poise, spontaneity, and self-confidence in personal and social interaction. Trait equivalent: SPONTANEITY - indicating factors such as poise, spontaneity, self-confidence, and vivaciousness in personal and social interaction.

5. Sa (self acceptance) (34 items). Purpose: To assess factors such as sense of personal worth, self-acceptance, and capacity for independent thinking and action. Trait equivalent: SELF-ACCEPTANCE - reflecting one's sense of personal worth and satisfaction with one's self; relative freedom from self-doubt and critical attitudes about one's self.

6. Wb (sense of well-being) (44 items). Purpose: To identify persons who minimize their worries and complaints, and who are relatively free from anxiety and disillusionment. Trait equivalent: SENSE OF WELL-BEING - indicating a sense of physical and emotional well-being and comfort; the feeling of being able to enjoy life.

Class II. Measures of socialization, maturity, and social responsibility.

7. Re (responsibility) (42 items). Purpose: To identify persons of conscientious, responsible, and dependable disposition and temperament. Trait equivalent: RESPONSIBILITY - indicating seriousness of thought and manner, conscientiousness, dependability, and uprightness; being the kind of person that others tend to trust and to rely upon.

8. So (socialization) (54 items). Purpose: To indicate the degree of social maturity, probity,and rectitude which the individual has attained. Trait equivalent: PROPRIETY - indicating a strong sense of probity and propriety; acceptance of rules, proper authority, and custom; a person who seldom if ever gets into trouble.

9. Sc (self control) (50 items). Purpose: To assess the degree and adequacy of self-regulation and self-control, and the freedom from impulsivity and self-centeredness. Trait equivalent: SELF CONTROL - indicating the degree and adequacy of self-regulation and self-control; not impulsive, or given to acting on the spur of the moment.

10. To (tolerance) (32 items). Purpose: To identify persons with permissive, accepting, and non-judgmental social beliefs and attitudes. Trait equivalent: TOLERANCE - indicating attitudes of permissiveness, tolerance, and acceptance of others; being open-minded and unprejudiced about beliefs and values quite different from one's own.

11. Gi (good impression) (40 items). Purpose: To identify persons capable of creating a favorable impression and who are concerned about how others react to them. Trait equivalent: GOOD IMPRESSION - indicating an interest in making a good impression and being concerned about how others will react to oneself.

California Psychological Inventory (continued)

12. Cm (communality) (23 items). Purpose: To indicate the degree to which an individual's reactions and responses correspond to the modal ("common") pattern established for the inventory. Trait equivalent: SIMILARITY TO OTHERS - indicating a fitting in with the crowd, having the same reactions and feelings as everyone else, seeing things the way most people see them.

Class III. Measures of achievement potential and intellectual efficiency.

13. Ac (achievement via conformance) (38 items). Purpose: To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where autonomy and independence are positive behaviors. Trait equivalent: ADAPTIVE ACHIEVEMENT- indicating someone with a strong need for achievement, and who is at his best in situations having definite rules and structure.

14. Ai (achievement via independence) (32 items). Purpose: To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where autonomy and independence are positive behaviors. Trait equivalent: INDEPENDENT ACHIEVEMENT - indicating the kind of person who has a strong need for achievement, and who is at his best in new or untried situations where he must work on his own and without external guidance.

15. Ie (intellectual efficiency) (52 items). Purpose: To indicate the degree of personal and intellectual efficiency which the individual has attained. Trait equivalent: INTELLECTUAL EFFICIENCY - indicating the efficiency with which one uses intellectual and personal resources; the ability to start working quickly, without need to delay or procrastinate, and to keep working on intellectual tasks over long periods of time.

Class IV. Measures of personal orientation and attitudes towards life.

16. Py (psychological-mindedness) (22 items). Purpose: To measure the degree to which the individual is interested in, and responsive to, the inner needs, motives, feelings, and experiences of others. Trait equivalent: SENSITIVITY TO OTHERS - indicating the degree to which one is interested in and responsive to the inner needs, motives, and feelings of others; being intraceptive, sensitive to others; having a knack of understanding how others feel and react inwardly.

17. Fx (flexibility) (22 items). Purpose: To indicate the degree of flexibility and adaptability of a person's thinking and social behavior. Trait equivalent: FLEXIBILITY - indicating the degree of flexibility and adaptability of a person's thinking and social behavior; the liking for change and innovation and even a preference for things new and untried.

California Psychological Inventory (continued)

18. Fe. (femininity) (38 items). Purpose: To assess the masculinity or femininity of temperament (high scores more feminine, low scores more masculine). Trait equivalent: NURTURANCE - indicating the tendency to help and support others through patience and loving kindness; being in general gentle and sympathetic. (Low scorers tend to be more decisive, robust,and action-oriented)

Publisher: Consulting Psychologists Press, 577 College Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

APPENDIX C

Minnesota Inventory of Social Work Knowledge

This inventory consists of 97 multiple choice questions on social work knowledge, including history and philosophy of social work/social welfare; social policies and issues; social security and social welfare; fields of social work/social welfare; profession of social work; and practice of social work.

It has been pre-tested at the University of Minnesota and is still undergoing revision. Their results in further pre-testing will be available. In addition it is possible that it might be pre-tested on students at San Diego State, that faculty may be involved in refining and revising items, etc.

APPENDIX D

CALENDAR OF PROGRESS AND PLANNING ON UNDERGRADUATE SOCIAL WELFARE PROJECT

I. September, 1966 - June 30, 1967 First Year

- Outlining and clarifying objectives, dimensions and design of project, developing criteria for new curriculum.
- Discussion with undergraduate faculty and Advisory Committee to the project on developments, objectives, curriculum content, etc.
- Approval of preliminary plans and curricular changes by School of Social Work Faculty.
- Meetings with other State Colleges to discuss project.
- Presentation of paper on project at Salt Lake City CSWE meeting.
- Development of basic structure of new program and preparation of curricular changes -- Curricular changes approved May 25, 1967 by College Senate.
- Development of objectives of undergraduate program.
- Meetings with County Welfare Department officials to discuss project.
- Literature research on curriculum, design and evaluation.
- Initial discussions of syllabi for undergraduate-graduate continuum in each of the sequences.

APPENDIX D (continued)

II. July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968 - Second Year

- Continuation of literature search, development of design, clarification of objectives, development of criteria for evaluation.
- Continue discussions and development of syllabi for each of the sequences.
- Preparation and discussion of Track II curriculum in Graduate School, presentation to faculty and other college committees concerned with curricula change.
- Continue meetings with County Welfare Department officials, faculty, Advisory Committee Meetings.
- Meeting with other colleges with related projects.
- Specification of variables to be evaluated and instruments, schedules and devices to be used in collection of data and evaluation.
- Further clarification of objectives of program (graduate-undergraduate continuum)
- Administration of instruments on pilot basis - graduates and undergraduates.
- Administration of instruments to graduating seniors (social welfare majors) in Spring 1968 as one control group and
- Preparation of application for extension of grant.

III. July 1, 1968 - June 30, 1969

- Final preparation of syllabi for each undergraduate sequence.
- Administration of appropriate instruments to social welfare majors (Fall, 1968, also Spring 1969)
- First class begins new program, Fall 1968 - Juniors entering upper division.
- Preparation of accreditation with C.S.W.E. for Track II on experimental basis.
- Administration of appropriate instruments to entering graduate students in Fall 1968, possibly also Spring 1969.
- Final report on first three years of project.

IV. July 1, 1969 - June 30, 1970

- Pilot class completing social welfare major Spring 1970; Administration of appropriate instruments.
- Track I control group completing second year graduate training, Spring 1970, administration of appropriate instruments.

V. July 1, 1970 - June 30, 1971

- Pilot class enters Track II graduate curriculum, Fall 1970; Administration of appropriate instruments.
- Evaluation of stages A & B of project, Summer 1970

VI. July 1, 1971 - June 30, 1972

- Pilot class completes MSW in Track II, Administration of appropriate instruments.
- Evaluation of Stage C of project, Summer or Fall 1971
- Administration of appropriate instruments to employees of the County Welfare Department.

VII. July 1, 1972 - September 30, 1972

- Evaluation of Stage D and preparation of final report on the project.